

Multiplicity in the documentation of performance-based artworks: Displaying multi-media documentation in Rebecca Horn's *Body Sculptures* at Tate

Acatia Finbow, Collaborative Doctoral Award Student, University of Exeter and Tate.

acatia1@hotmail.com, 7 Mackie Road, Brixton, London, SW2 2ED, (+44)7875142495

This research was supported by an AHRC-funded Collaborative Doctoral Award studentship and the AHRC-funded research project 'Performance at Tate: Into the Space of Art' (2014 – 2016)

Abstract

This paper addresses some of the key issues around authenticity within the ephemeral performance and durable document dichotomy. Engaging with these two artistic practices within the frame of the museum and in the context of displays and exhibitions, this paper considers some of the ways in which the role of performance documentation has been reassessed over the past twenty years. It will focus on the access the document provides to a now absent 'performance moment', and the benefit of acquiring and displaying multiple types of documentation. The significance of the museum visitor experience of performance-based artworks in the absence of the performance moment will be used to question the traditional definitions of authenticity in the museum.

Keywords

Performance, documentation, Rebecca Horn, Body Sculptures, authenticity

Introduction

Since the early 1990s, there have been those who have argued strongly that the value of performance-based artworks lies in their ephemerality, their inherent disappearance, and their subsequent loss. Those approaching performance-based artworks through this lens include Peggy Phelan and her oft cited claim that '[p]erformance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations of representations: once it does so, it becomes something other than performance' (Phelan, 1993, p. 146), and Matthew Reason, who claims that the transience of performance is an 'aesthetic value in its own right' (Reason, 2006, p. 11). The brevity of performance-based artworks is tied closely into what is valued within it as an artistic practice; by contrast, performance documentation is often seen to be durable and able to fix the artwork in both time and space.

This especially comes into focus when these performance-based artworks are situated within the museum, or in other contexts where the collection of the artwork necessitates an endurance that Phelan suggests undermines the intrinsic value of performance. The museum is, fundamentally, an institution which has used, organised, and preserved objects within (art) historical narratives. Susan Pearce addresses the 'material-orientated' museum (Pearce, 1990; 1992, p. 3) throughout her writing, and Jon Erickson reiterates the space of the museum as an objectifying frame even for performance: '[a]n "art object" [...] is not something static; rather it is something that is always being objectified as long as attention is paid to it' (Erickson, 1995, p. 5). This tension between an apparently ephemeral performance-based artwork and the object-focused museum has resulted in recent shifts in practices, from curatorial (see Wood, 2014; Wood and Laurenson, 2017) to conservation practices (see Laurenson and van Saaze, 2014), and in the programming and positioning of performance within museum exhibitions and displays (see Bishop, 2014; Groys, 2008). There has also been a relatively recent rise in the number of repeatable, iterative live art works being created by artists, and acquired by museums. Performance and live art works are increasingly at the centre of the long-term reconsideration of objecthood and objectification in the visual arts and the art museum (Danto, 1997; Erickson, 1995; von Hantelmann, 2010). The case study of Rebecca Horn's *Body Sculptures* at Tate in this paper will be used to explore these shifts in greater depth, and consider how the museum navigates the nature of the authentic artwork when collecting and displaying a performance-based artwork.

The act of performance documentation undertaken by Horn and countless other artists throughout history marks an intersection between the performance-based artwork and the art museum. It is a practice which remains contested, but equally has existed alongside performance in the museum

throughout history (see Giannachi and Westerman, 2017). At the heart of many of the criticisms of the practice of performance documentation is the argument that it is different on an ontological level to the performance moment, or as Phelan suggests, it is 'something other than performance' (Phelan, 1993, p. 146). Other criticisms, however, have been tempered by observations of the usefulness and potential of performance documentation, a key consideration of this paper at large. RoseLee Goldberg, performance art historian, suggests that performance was 'an art form which ceased to exist the moment the performance was over' (Goldberg, 1998, p. 15), but also acknowledges the potential value of using photographic performance documentation to circulate those works through her comprehensive written histories (p. 33 – 34). Adrian Heathfield similarly suggests that it seems performance 'disappears fast and leaves the scarcest trace for historical record' (Heathfield, 2001, p. 105), while himself supporting the creation and dissemination of performance documentation collections (Heathfield, 2004). There is a sense within these approaches that the difference between the live performance moment and the performance document must be acknowledged, but that this difference is also key in allowing the existence and circulation of performance-based artworks within art historical narratives.

The approaches of Goldberg and Heathfield demonstrate that the value performance documentation has remained contested, but that its usefulness in a variety of contexts is increasingly a point of focus. In particular, the acceptance of ontological differences between performance and documentation challenge some long-held value perceptions and suggest an act of transformation occurring between the presentation of the artwork as an ephemeral performance and its presentation through enduring documentation. Rebecca Horn's *Body Sculptures* illustrate this potential for use within performance documentation, in that her live performance moment, a short performance involving a wearable sculpture, was documented through a range of materials and forms – drawing, photography, film, and sculptural object – which now constitute the 'displayable' element of the work. As this paper will go on to explore, the museum navigates the need to present historical performance-based artworks by engaging with this act of transformation and utilising the potential held within performance documentation.

These shifting approaches and perspectives also bring to the surface additional ontological issues which need to be addressed by those within the museum, including authenticity, authorship, and originality, terms often used in the criticism of performance documentation as a practice. This paper will return to the notion of authenticity within the case study, and consider how the museum's engagement with performance documents in displays and exhibitions begins to break away from long-held belief in 'the isolable genius of the singular artist' (Schneider, 2011, p. 130) and from an absolute truth of the artwork (see Jones, 2012; ten Thije, 2012). Rather, this paper will explore whether 'arguably, if we create multiple representations, as a whole they will bring us closer to the elusive truth' (Jones et al, 2009, p. 167) of the performance moment. This approach takes truth not to be an absolute, but a subjective experience of an artwork which exists not only in a performance moment, but beyond it and into the future in part through encountering documentation in the museum display.

Changes in Approaches to Performance Documentation

There have been numerous approaches to performance documentation which emphasise a criticism of the practice, based on its fundamental difference to the live performance moment. Erika Fischer-Lichte emphasises the fundamental immateriality of performance (Fischer-Lichte, 2008), while artist Mary Oliver, perhaps somewhat cynically, suggests 'we have found ways to [...] cryogenically support [performance], to mummify it and plasticize it so that way beyond its lifetime, it can be critiqued

using the means through which it was documented' (Oliver, 2014, pp. 15-16). However there has been a fairly persistent change in attitudes to performance documentation across the fields of performance studies, art history, and museology in the last twenty years. These have, generally, sought to reformulate the relationship between performance moment and performance document, and to engage with that usefulness Goldberg and Heathfield explore. Philip Auslander, responding directly to Phelan, has both suggested that performance documentation also has the capacity to disappear, just as the performance moment does (Auslander, 2008, p. 50), and that all performances are created, to some extent, as material for a future audience who will experience it through the documentation (p. 31). There begins to be ground upon which the difference between performance moment and performance document, while still acknowledged, is filled with potential: what is it that the performance document might be able to do, in the longer-term, that the performance moment might not? How might performance documentation support the extended experience of the effect of the artwork?

This shifting of the divide between the ontologies of performance and documentation, and the resituating of terms such as 'authenticity' from being the privilege of the performance moment as designated by the artist, raises a stronger sense of potential for what the performance document might be able to do. There have been numerous theorists who have sought to emphasise this potential. Rebecca Schneider has particularly confronted the potential of the performance document to facilitate a continuation of the performance-based artwork, through the ways in which the viewer comes to experience the artwork. She suggests that 'performance remains, but remains differently' (Schneider, 2011, p. 101) through performance documentation; rather than disappearing, performance is transformed through the process of documentation, and in being so transformed, persists. She also notes the potential role for documentation in facilitating re-enactment in the future (p. 28), and to provide an experience of a 'live' performance through an imaginative encounter with a performance document (2007, p. 34). Similarly, Christopher Bedford in his brief but significant outlining of a 'viral ontology' for performance, suggests that it is through a 'variety of media' (Bedford, 2012, p. 78) that performance persists across time and space; the performance document becomes the means by which the performance artwork is expanded and extended and can come to be present within the future museum display.

While Schneider and Bedford, among others (Auslander, 2006; 2008; Clarke and Warren, 2009), offer a reading of the potential for performance documentation to expand and continue the work of the artist, there are also those theorists and practitioners who have begun to explore the potential for museum-created documentation to support performance-based artworks. Vivian van Saaze, focusing on installation art but with observations relevant to performance-based artworks, has explored the influence of documentation – or the lack of documentation - within conservation practices, especially around artworks which require some element of re-creation within their life in the museum: 'In the same manner as documentation may guide decision in conservation, also gaps in documentation or blind spots may influence practices' (van Saaze, 2013, p. 107). She explores instances within which the process of documentation, as much as the documents themselves, directly shape the existence of the artwork within the museum across time, an issue strongly resonant to the *Body Sculptures* case study in this article (van Saaze, 2013, p. 114; van Saaze and Dekker, 2013). Van Saaze, along with Renée van de Vall (2015) and Laurensen (2006), explore the ways in which the contemporary artwork might change across the course of its life in the museum; the authenticity of the artwork, therefore, is no longer necessarily fixed by the artist at the point of creation, but can be formed and reformed across time within the museum.

Moving beyond those theorists and critics who consider the link between performance document and performance moment on a purely ontological level, there is an increasing prevalence of practical approaches to performance documentation. Rather than focusing on the difference between performance moment and performance document as being inherently negative, as a transformation through the loss of ephemerality and liveness, there is evidently a practical thread which sees a strong potential for performance documentation which is manifest within the museum. Rather than focusing on the difference as problematic, these approaches instead consider what it is that performance documentation can do for the museum in relation to performance. The following section expands on this theoretical and practical ground to explore the ways in which a multiplicity of performance documentation presents a plurality of access points to a now-absent performance moment, enabling the individual to engage in their own 'authentic' experience of the performance-based artwork.

The Implications of Multiplicity

The idea of the benefits and potential of multiplicity within performance documentation is becoming more common in studies of performance and the museum. In the case of the former, Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks have suggested that the documentation of performances often mimics the crime scene report, in that 'performance survives as a cluster of narratives' (Pearson and Shank, 2001, p. 57). Similarly, Paul Clarke and Julian Warren, who focus on performance archives, suggest that 'art events are disseminated as rumours, hearsay and spectators' stories' (Clarke and Warren, 2009, p. 54). These observations reiterate Schneider and Bedford's models of experience and dissemination through performance documentation created by numerous authors and presenting a variety of viewpoints. Rather than engaging with a singular perspective on a performance moment, and viewing the performance document as a fixing of this, these approaches suggest a plurality. Here, multiple perspectives can be presented of the same performance moment, allowing the viewer to engage with a collection of possible narratives. Rather than suggesting a hierarchy of ways to encounter a performance moment, in which 'being there' is preferable, these approaches remain open to alternative, equally 'authentic' means of engagement. How the museum might navigate presenting these viewpoints and facilitating that engagement will be explored shortly.

In the museum, this multiplicity most often comes up around new media and time-based artworks, particularly where there is a potential for change within the artwork, and through this often also interrogates the notion of authenticity. Pip Laurenson, Head of Collection Care Research at Tate, observes that '[i]f the ontological framework is focused on the material so will the notion of authenticity. If the ontological framework shifts, then we expect a similar shift in our concepts of authenticity, change and loss' (Laurenson, 2006, p. 4). Where there is a complexity around the materiality of the artwork there is equally a complexity around what element of the work can be determined to be 'authentic'. Rudolf Frieling, Curator for Media Arts at SFMoMA, raises questions of authenticity in cases where curators and others in the museum take on an element of the (re)creation of an artwork in the absence of the artist (2014), and in the same edited volume, Caitlin Jones acknowledges that '[h]ow we define authenticity in an era of multiplicity and versions is a central focus for artists, conservators, and collectors' (Jones, 2014, p. 160). Ultimately, Jones concludes, '[t]erms like authentic, original and unique, while perhaps not 'inconsequential,' have shifted from absolute to gradients of managed change' (p. 168). These artistic practices, including performance-based, iterative works, have shifted notions of authenticity through managed change, alteration, and alternative presentations of artworks.

Within these approaches, there is a strong sense that across practices of creation, collection, curation and conservation, there has been a move away from the singularity of the author and absolutism around authenticity (see also Dutton, 2003; Godlovitch, 1999; Lowenthal, 1990). Theorists such as Rosalind Krauss (1985), Schneider (2011) and Bedford (2012) begin to delve into the possibility that an artwork might be part of an expanded and ongoing practice, which does not end with the performance moment, but through documentation ‘splinters, mutates, and multiplies over time’ (Bedford, 2012, p. 78). There is the potential for multiple iterations of a work to fall under the umbrella of the life of an expanded artwork (see van Saaze, 2013; van de Vall et al, 2011; Phillips, 2015). The question now, arguably, becomes how authenticity is located within an expanded and ongoing creative practice. As Krauss suggests, ‘authenticity empties out as a notion’ within art forms which ‘are inherently multiple’ (Krauss, 1985, p. 152). The turn towards co-authorship in the museum, the nature of iterative artworks, and the role of the performance document in providing an access point to an historical performance moment would suggest that a focus on authenticity needs to consider an experience of the artwork rather than its ‘truth’. In the vein of art historian Amelia Jones’s assertion that ‘while the experience of viewing a photograph and reading a text is clearly different from that of sitting in a small room watching an artist perform, neither has a privileged relationship to the historical “truth” of the performance’ (Jones, 2012, p. 203), the following case study of Rebecca Horn’s *Body Sculptures* will explore how those engaging with the display of the work at Tate have navigated the body of interconnected performance documents in order to create the potential for an experience of the expanded artwork. Although negotiated, as will become clear, with the artist, this approach to displaying *Body Sculptures* does not fixate on an authorial authenticity, but in locating the exhibition-centred iteration of the performance-based artwork, allowing the museum visitor the possibility of engagement after the live performance moment has passed.

The Case Study: Rebecca Horn’s *Body Sculptures*

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, German artist Rebecca Horn created a collection of over twenty wearable sculptures, made of wood, metal, material and feathers. These were designed to be attached to the body of the wearer and used for single-occurrence performances, which were then recorded on film; they were the result of a period of convalescence for Horn when she said ‘[t]he only work I could do while confined to bed was to design and sew these body-sculptures from material’ (Celant and Horn, 1993, p. 15-6). The performances often lacked an audience other than Horn and those supporting the performance and filming, meaning that the subsequent films were the primary means by which the performance moments were intended to be seen. However, beginning in the late 1990s, a full range of performance documents and artefacts around the *Body Sculptures* have been incrementally acquired into the collection at Tate. The performance moment was documented through a range of media, including drawing, film, photography, and in the sculptural objects themselves. As of 2009, Tate owned the full range of surviving objects and documents, engaging not only with the performance moments of the project, but with the entirety of the expanded performance-based artwork. Horn was clear at the point of acquisition that the price for the sculptural works had been reduced ‘due to Tate’s binding commitment to keep the collection of early works together and not to dispose of individual pieces for whatever reason’ (Horn, 1998); already there was a sense of a collection within the nature of the work, to which Tate had committed. Each element acquired – which will be explored in greater detail below – entered the collection as individually catalogued artworks, while also being part of a larger whole through their connection to a specific performance moment. This case study explores these individual ‘artworks’ and how the museum has, across the past two decades, developed a new collection-display of these works which constitutes the current life of the *Body Sculptures* artwork.

The acquisition of the sculptural objects themselves began in 1999 but wasn't completed until 2009, where the twenty sculptures formally entered Tate's collection. They had previously been exhibited at Tate in a 1994 touring exhibition of Horn's work – where they were described as 'theatrical requisites unpacked for display' (Tate Gallery, 1994) - and again in 2000 curated by Sean Rainbird as part of the inaugural displays at Tate Modern. In a letter to Sir Jacob Rothschild, Chairman of the National Heritage Memorial Fund, then Director of Tate, Nicholas Serota explained that Horn had been persuaded to show the sculptures following the 1994 exhibition, as she had not intended to show them prior to this (Serota, 1997). In the same letter, Serota also noted that '[a]dditionally each case [for the sculptures] contains a framed black and white photograph that shows the sculpture in use' (Serota, 1997); there was, already at the point of acquisition, an intersection between the performance document of the sculpture and that of the photograph, with the evident intention that they be shown alongside one another. In 2000, the artist gifted to Tate copies of her three films which documented the performances made using the sculptures: *Performances I* 1972, *Performances II* 1973 and *Berlin Exercises: Dreaming under Water* 1974-5. Each of the films showed extracts from a selection of the performances. On occasion, the stills which accompanied the sculptures in their acquisition were still taken directly from the films. These films, despite being acquired as artworks by Tate, were often referred to as 'documents' (Serota, 1997; Tate Gallery, 2000), although the 1994 exhibition catalogue carefully noted that 'they were not merely simple documentation' (Tate Gallery, 1994, p. 4) shedding light on the complex status of these documents-as-artworks. Finally, in 2009 Tate acquired a small selection of drawings titled collectively as the *Hospital Drawings*, which pre-dated the sculptures and the performances. Horn herself noted that '[d]rawing was, and remains, fundamental for my ideas' (Celant and Horn, 1993, p. 16). These drawings were in biro or pencil and were pre-emptive sketches of a number of the *Body Sculptures*, often including written details about duration and actions to be undertaken and showing the sculptures themselves on faceless figures, as they would be worn once materially manifest. Serota noted in a letter to Horn that these were acquired in the belief they would 'complement our holdings of your [Horn's] sculpture' (Serota, 2007) again emphasising an awareness on the part of the museum and the artist of the interconnectivity of these various performance documents.

In 2015 a small collection of Horn's work was put on display in one of the permanent collection galleries in the Boiler House building at Tate Modern, moving into the Blavatnik Building after its opening in 2016. In this display the *Body Sculptures* were central and elements of each of the collections – the drawings, films, photographs, and sculptures – was put on display. In the case, for example, of *Moveable Shoulder Extensions* 1971, the pre-emptive sketch *Untitled* 1968-9 was framed and displayed on the wall next to the film still of the performance underway and in close proximity to the sculpture. The sculpture was displayed in the upright position, displayed as it would have been worn: at a height of approximately 170cm, on a wall rest which allowed the two black, fabric 'prongs' to sit upright, as they would have done on the shoulders of the male performer during the performance moment (Sommermeier, 2000). Horn's demand during the acquisition process had been that she would 'be involved and have final say in the final design for the new installation of the body sculptures (glass display cases, etc.)' (Horn, 1998) and *Moveable Shoulder Extensions* was displayed according to her instructions. Finally, *Performances I*, which included a few minutes of footage showing the performance undertaken with *Moveable Shoulder Extensions* was also on display in the gallery. This was the first instance at Tate of all the facets of the *Body Sculptures* collection being on display together, and mimicked Armin Zweite's observations about Horn's progression of artistic practice: 'This transition charts the shift from Rebecca Horn's drawings to the realm of objects, from there into the sphere of their application in performance and finally to

their recording in the medium of film, which combines graphic visibility with repeatability' (Zweite, 2006, p. 15).

Multiplicity on Display

Horn's extensive practices of documentation, and Tate's subsequent deliberate collection and display of these provide an insight into the role of the document within the continued existence of complex artworks within the museum. They especially provide an interesting perspective on the use of an artist's performance documents within the museum because they were not necessarily originally intended to go on display; Horn had disposed of other sculptures which might have otherwise been part of the *Body Sculptures* collection, there are only a small number of *Hospital Drawings*, and Serota had noted that Horn had to be persuaded to display the sculptures (Serota, 1997). However, Horn equally explained that '[t]he soft body-sculptures and the body-extensions are very fragile. To preserve and travel with them, I constructed each one a suitcase, like a box for surgical implement or a case for a musical instrument' (Celant and Horn, 1993, p. 21); there was a sense from the artist of a need to preserve and keep at least some of the works for a non-specified future audience. As noted above, she insisted that the full collection be kept by Tate indefinitely and she closely controlled the display of the works, even using the loaded term 'installation' (Horn, 1998) in a discussion of how they would be shown. While their display within the museum may not have been an initial consideration for Horn – except through the carefully edited film collections – once it became clear that display was an option, Horn and the museum negotiated how an experience of the full *Body Sculptures* artwork could be facilitated. There is a strong sense here that what the artist had initially felt to be the authentic presentation of the works – the performance moments and the films – had shifted and expanded from their creation in the early 1970s to the point of acquisition in the late 1990s and early 2000s, to include other documents and a specific style of collective display.

What can be seen in Tate's 2015 displays, then, is a new stage within the 'life' of the *Body Sculptures* expanded artwork; it is a stage which pulls together multiple points of access to a now absent performance moment, and in doing so offers a plurality of temporal points of engagement for the viewer. In the *Hospital Drawings* the viewer can engage in the pre-performance imagining undertaken by Horn in her design process, to see Horn's means of creating an 'outline [of] nascent ideas' (Schmidt, 2006, p. 49). In the photographs and the films they can engage in exploring instances of the performance moment, presented from different angles and for different durations. In engaging directly with the sculpture, in the case of *Moveable Shoulder Extensions* as it would have been worn, the viewer can engage in a bodily relationship to the material artefact, contextualised both by how it is displayed and by the accompanying documents-as-artworks. The before, the during, and the after of the performance moment are on display within the museum. Critics of the exhibitions of Horn's work, acting as the equivalent to museum viewers, noted the implications of this in their various reviews. One unnamed journalist noted that 'some earlier pieces, presented as rather enigmatic informal reliefs, like tack hung on a stable wall, are revealed by photograph and documentation to be indeed functional' (Anon [The Financial Times], 1984, p. 15), while Urszula Szulakowska noted in *Art Monthly* a decade later that until this point '[a]dmirers of [Horn's] work inevitably feel nostalgic about these earlier works, hitherto known only from the performance photographs. They have never been displayed in this country in their accompanying black boxes' (Szulakowska, 1994). There is a strong suggestion, from these critical approaches to the works and from the choices made in the 2015 Tate display, that the intersection of multiple documents – drawings, photographs, films, sculptures – within one space offers a much richer experience for the viewer and allows a deeper understanding of the expanded artistic practice of Horn.

Although the performance moment is not present within the museum display, it is this absence which draws together the other elements of the *Body Sculptures* through the different documentary materials, presenting multiple points of access to it. By presenting multiple temporally-disparate ways for the museum visitor to engage with works such as *Moveable Shoulder Extensions*, each created by the artist, and straddling a complex division between performance document and artwork, a more complex sense of authenticity is created which is less concerned with an accurate 'representation' of the performance moment than it is with providing contextualising information about that performance-moment and Horn's expanded artistic practice. This is done, arguably, in order that the museum visitor can create their own well-contextualised and informed experience of both the performance moment and the expanded artwork. I would argue, therefore, that because the value of the *Body Sculptures* artwork is no longer located solely in the absent performance moment, but is instead present throughout the diverse collection of documents-as-artworks, the conservation of its authenticity is no longer about establishing an origin point within the performance moment but is about enabling this potential for the collective display of all the interconnected documents. This has also been acknowledged throughout the history of the works at Tate, with those in the museum noting that Horn 'has agreed to allow the Gallery to make sub-masters of the films and videos which document these objects in use' (Tate Gallery, 1997), pre-empting the need for the repeated display of the films, and the pre-acquisition report for the sculptures noting that '[w]e should consider the long term preservation of these images at acquisition stage, particularly if the photographs are always to be shown with the sculptures' (Tate Gallery, c. 1999). There has been a long-held understanding within the museum that it is only through the long-term availability of these performance documents in a displayable form that will allow the museum to successfully support the work in its current state, as it moves into the future through encounters with the museum visitor.

Where do we go from here?

The theorists explored within this paper and the practical example seen in the display of Horn's *Body Sculptures* works at Tate Modern, have explored some of the key shifts around authenticity and multiplicity in the documentation of performance-based works. Within works which are iterative, or which are presented through the existence of multiple 'parts' including a plethora of performance documents, there is a new relationship to be uncovered between the artist, the artwork, and individuals in the museum. This paper and the case study contained within it has been offered with the intention of exploring the possibilities the display of performance documents provides for allowing access to absent performance moments and the expanded performance-based artwork. It questions whether, in the case of substantial collections of interconnected performance documents, authenticity is today located across what is collected, and how it is subsequently displayed.

Rebecca Horn's *Body Sculptures* simultaneously provides us with an example of the potential which can be fulfilled in engaging in the exhibition of networks of interconnected performance documents, and with the challenge of what the legacy of the artwork will now go on to be. Without a discrete, material 'object' to focus on, and equally without a repeatable performance moment, what now constitutes the 'work' within the museum is not as distinct as it may once have been. It may equally continue to shift as the work continues its, to use van Saaze's choice of term, 'trajectory' through the museum (van Saaze, 2013, p. 28). Even the performance documents which constitute part of the display of *Moveable Shoulder Extensions – Untitled, Performances I* and the sculpture itself – are separate objects within the museum collection, and aren't held together by any mechanism other than a central connection to Horn and knowledge by individuals within the museum that they are part of a larger whole. It is the common ground they share with a performance moment which is

located outside of the museum which holds them together within this constellation, but that interconnectivity is not necessarily yet fully supported by the cataloguing and documenting mechanisms of the museum. Therefore, how the networks of supportive objects and documents in the museum display are recorded for posterity, and how far they are conserved in the same way as discrete art objects, requires closer consideration.

The transferal of the 2015 display from the Boiler House to the Blavatnik Building at Tate Modern in 2016 without any significant changes to the content indicates that there is a pervasive sense within the museum of the necessity of including these multiple performance documents within the display of the work. The repeated earlier use of the term 'reinforce' and 'complement' (Serota, 2007) by Serota in reference to the increasing breadth of Tate's collection of Horn's documentation-artworks emphasises this. Although not an installation in the traditional sense, the inclusion of the artist within the decisions made around the display does indicate that this has the potential to be the new 'authentic' presence of the *Body Sculptures* within the museum; that without the full scope of the documents created by Horn and acquired by Tate, the experience for the museum visitor would be in some way incomplete. In part, the co-operation of Horn, seen throughout her correspondence with Tate, have made this documentation-based iteration of the work possible in a way it may otherwise not have been, and has allowed a new 'authenticity' to be located within the openness of experience. The focus for the museum now perhaps lies in how to capture this next 'stage' of the artwork, defined by the way in which the work is displayed within the museum in accordance with the perceived wishes of the artist. This shines a light on the increasing importance of the accurate and detailed keeping of museum records, correspondence, and interviews, and the accessibility of these to others in the future.

There has, I would assert, been a significant shift in where the authenticity of the performance-based artwork can be found. It has been dislocated from the individual art object and a contained moment of creation, and may now, instead, be found in those longer-term interactions between the museum, the plurality of performance documents, and the way these are made accessible to visitors. *Moveable Shoulder Extensions* has become, some fifty years after the presentation of its live performance moment, an artwork presented through a multi-media display of temporally and materially diverse performance documents, which each offer a different element of an expanded artistic project which has been negotiated and developed by the artist alongside the museum. As Philip Auslander has posited, 'perhaps the authenticity of the performance document resides in its relationship to its beholder rather than to an ostensibly originary event: perhaps its authority is phenomenological rather than ontological' (Auslander, 2006, p. 9). The case study of Rebecca Horn's *Body Sculptures* at Tate suggests that this may indeed be the approach that the contemporary art museum is now taking towards complex, multi-faceted artworks. Our concern is perhaps now better encapsulated as being less to do with a continual referral to the authorial authenticity of the artworks and documents which are held within the museum, than with how to continue to activate these within the space of display in order to facilitate an engaging relationship between the documentation and the museum visitor, now and into the future.

Bibliography

Anon., 1984. 'Keeping in Step with the Avant Garde'. The Financial Times, 17 January 1984.

Auslander, P., 2008 [1998]. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Auslander, P., 2006. The Performativity of Performance Documentation. *PAJ*, 84(3), pp. 1-10.

- Bedford, C., 2012. 'The Viral Ontology of Performance'. In: A. Jones & A. Heathfield, eds. *Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History*. Bristol: Intellect, pp. 77-87.
- Bishop, C., 2014. 'The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA, and Whitney'. *Dance Research Journal*, 46(3), pp. 63-76.
- Celant, G. & Horn, R., 1994. 'Bastille Interviews I, Paris 1993'. In *Rebecca Horn*, New York: Guggenheim, pp. 15-22. Exhibition Catalogue.
- Clarke, P. & Warren, J., 2009. 'Ephemera: Between Archival Objects and Events'. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 30(1), pp. 45-66.
- Danto, A. C., 1997. *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dutton, D., 2003. 'Authenticity in Art'. In: J. Levinson, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 258 – 274.
- Erickson, J., 1995. *The Fate of the Object: From Modern Object to Postmodern Sign in Performance, Art, and Poetry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fischer-Lichte, E., 2008. *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*. London: Routledge.
- Frieling, R., 2014. 'The Museum as Producer: Processing Art and Performing a Collection'. In: B. Graham, ed. *New Collecting: Exhibiting and Audiences after New Media Art*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 135 – 158.
- Giannachi, G., and Westerman, J., 2017. *Histories of Performance Documentation: Museum, Artistic and Scholarly Practices*, London: Routledge.
- Godlovitch, S., 1999. 'Performance authenticity: possible, practical, virtuous'. In: S. Kemal and I. Gaskell, eds. *Performance and Authenticity in the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 154 – 174.
- Goldberg, R., 1998. *Performance: Live Art since the 60s*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Groys, B., 2008. *Art Power*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Heathfield, A., 2001. 'End Time Now'. In: A. Heathfield, ed. *Small Acts: Performance, the Millennium and the Marking of Time*. London: Black Dog Publishing, pp. 104-111.
- Heathfield, A., 2004. *Live: Art and Performance*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Horn, R., 1998, 'Letter to Nicholas Serota', *Tate Gallery Records: Rebecca Horn, Acquisition*, 16 February 1998, PC10.1.
- Jones, A., 2012. 'Temporal anxiety/'Presence' in Absentia: Experiencing Performance as Documentation'. In: G. Giannachi, N. Kaye & M. Shanks, eds. *Archaeologies of Presence: Art, performance and the persistence of being*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 197-221.
- Jones, C., 2014. 'Objects, Intent, and Authenticity: Producing, Selling, and Conserving Media Art'. In: B. Graham, ed. *New Collecting: Exhibiting and Audiences after New Media Art*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 159 – 170.
- Jones, S., Abbott, D. & Ross, S., 2009. 'Redefining the Performing Arts Archive'. *Archival Science*, 9(3-4), pp. 165-171.

- Krauss, R., 1985. *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Laurenson, P., 2006. 'Authenticity, Change and Loss in the Conservation of Time-Based Media Installations'. *Tate Papers*, 6. <http://www.tate.org.uk/download/file/fid/7401> [accessed 22 November 2016].
- Laurenson, P. & van Saaze, V., 2014. 'Collecting Performance-Based Art: New Challenges and Shifting Perspectives'. In: O. Remes, L. MacCulloch & M. Leino, eds. *Performativity in the Gallery: Staging Interactive Encounters*. Oxford: Peter Lang, pp. 27-41.
- Lowenthal, D., 1990. 'Authenticity? The dogma of self-delusion'. In: M. Jones, ed. *Why Fakes Matter: Essays on Problems of Authenticity*. London: British Museum Press, pp. 184 – 192.
- Oliver, M., 2014. 'Lies, Lies, It's All Lies I Tell You!'. In: O. Remes, L. MacCulloch & M. Leino, eds. *Performativity in the Gallery: Staging Interactive Encounters*. Oxford: Peter Lang, pp. 11-25.
- Pearce, S., 1990. 'Objects as meaning; or narrating the past'. In: S. Pearce, ed. *Objects of Knowledge*, London: The Athlone Press, pp. 125 – 140.
- Pearce, S., 1992. *Museums, Objects and Collections: A Cultural Study*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Pearson, M., and Shanks, M., 2001. *Theatre/Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Phelan, P., 1993. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London: Routledge.
- Phillips, J., 2015. 'Reporting Iterations: A Documentation Model for Time-Based Media Art' in *Performing Documentation in the Conservation of Contemporary Art*, *Revista de História da Arte*, 04, pp. 168 - 179
- Reason, M., 2006. *Documentation, Disappearance and the Representation of Live Performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmidt, K., 2006. 'Rebecca Horn: Drawings from 1964 – 2004'. In: *Rebecca Horn: Drawings, Sculptures, Installations, Films 1964 – 2006*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2006, pp. 13 – 43.
- Schneider, R., 2007. 'The Document Performance'. In: M. Vason, ed. *Encounters*. Bristol: Arnolfini, pp. 34-36.
- Schneider, R., 2011. *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*. London: Routledge.
- Serota, N., 1997, 'Letter to Sir Jacob Rothschild', *Tate Gallery Records: Rebecca Horn: Acquisition*, PC10.1, 30 July 1997.
- Serota, N., 2007, 'Letter to Rebecca Horn', *Tate Gallery Records: Rebecca Horn, Acquisition*, PC10.1, 20 December 2007.
- Sommermeier, B., 2000, 'General Report', *Tate Gallery Records: Rebecca Horn: Acquisitions*, PC4.2, 24 February 2000.
- Szulakowska, U., 1994. 'Ghosts in the Machines'. *Art Monthly*, November. Tate Gallery, 1994. *Rebecca Horn*. London: Tate Publishing. Exhibition catalogue.

Tate Gallery, 1997, 'Heritage Lottery Fund Application Form', *Tate Gallery Records: Rebecca Horn, Acquisitions*, PC10.1, 30 July 1997.

Tate Gallery, c. 1999, 'Paper Conservation Pre-acquisition Conservation Report', *Tate Gallery Records: Rebecca Horn, Acquisitions*, PC4.2

Tate Gallery, 2000, 'Tate Modern Display Lists', *Tate Gallery Records: Tate Modern*, TG 12/12/3/5, 3 May 2000.

ten Thijs, S., 2012. 'Two Different Histories - Combating Forms of History in Performance Art and the Museum'. In: S. Gareis, Schoellhammer & P. Weibel, eds. *Moments: A History of Performance in 10 Acts*. Köln: ZKM, pp. 456-460.

van de Vall, R., Hölling, H., Scholte, T. and Stigter, S., 2011, 'Reflections of a Biographical Approach to Contemporary Art Conservation'. ICOM-CC: 16th Triennial Conference, Lisbon, 19-23 September 2011.

van de Vall, R., 2015, 'Documenting Dilemmas: On the Relevance of Ethically Ambiguous Cases', in *Performing Documentation in the Conservation of Contemporary Art*, Revista de História da Arta, 04, pp. 7 - 17.

van Saaze, V., 2013. *Installation Art and the Museum: Presentation and Conservation of Changing Artworks*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

van Saaze, V., and Dekker, A., 2013. 'Surprising usages of a documentation model: On the notion of boundary objects and beyond'. *International Journal of Performance Arts & Digital Media*, 9:1, pp. 99 – 113.

von Hantelmann, D., 2010. *How to Do Things with Art*. Zurich: JRP Ringier.

Wood, C., 2014. 'In Advance of the Broken Arm: Collecting Live Art and the Museum's Changing Game'. In: T. Calonge, ed. *Live Forever: Collecting Live Art*, London: Koenig Books, pp. 123 - 145.

Wood, C., and Laurenson, P., 2017, 'In conversation with Jonah Westerman, June 2016'. In: G. Giannachi, and J. Westerman, eds. *Histories of Performance Documentation: Museum, Artistic and Scholarly Practices*, London: Routledge, pp. 28 - 34.

Zweite, A., 2006. 'Rebecca Horn's Bodylandscapes', in *Rebecca Horn: Drawings, Sculptures, Installations, Films 1964 – 2006*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2006, pp. 13 – 43.